

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

GREGORY BENDER,

No. C 09-1152 SI

8 Plaintiff,
v.

ORDER RE: CASE SCHEDULING

MAXIM INTEGRATED PRODUCTS, INC.,

Defendant.

13 The parties have submitted a Joint Case Management Statement (Docket No. 19) which does not
14 adequately address the issues which will be discussed at the conference on Tuesday, September 15,
15 2009. The action has been pending since March 16, 2009, and this initial scheduling conference,
16 originally set for July 1, 2009, has already been continued twice, once at plaintiff's request. It is not
17 "too early for a scheduling order," as plaintiff asserts. It may be that the schedule mapped out by the
18 Northern District's Patent Local Rules is appropriate, but the parties must consider that schedule in light
19 of the particular needs of this case. In particular, this Court is reluctant to defer or delay this case
20 merely because of the pendency of other similar cases.

21 The parties are ORDERED to meet and confer concerning scheduling prior to the September 15,
22 2009 Conference. The Court intends to adopt a schedule for the balance of this case at the Conference.

24 || IT IS SO ORDERED.

26 | Dated: September 14, 2009

Susan Illston
SUSAN ILLSTON
United States District Judge